

ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER

Published Semi-Monthly by

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, Inc.

350 Fifth Ave., New York 1, N. Y.

903 First National Bank Bldg., Utica 2, N. Y.

600 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.

1559 Continental Illinois Bank Bldg., Chicago 4, Ill.

Council Letter No. 149

August 15, 1946

Here's How to Deal With Communists

"MIKHAILOVITCH EXECUTED!"

A MONTH'S perspective throws into still bolder relief that headline in the news of July 17, 1946. Sometimes it is well to glance back at old newspapers—that many think are dead the day after they are printed.

Word of Mikhailovitch's death, universally predicted, was a blow between the eyes for the American people. The morning papers of the same day had stated: "The United States and Britain won't intervene." Thus Britain went back on her long tradition of freedom and liberty. Britain, with her nearness to Continental Europe, had the vestige of an excuse. The United States had no excuse whatever. The betrayal by our government of our country's traditions was complete.

* * * * *

Americans seem punch-drunk. Little seems to arouse them. *The New York Times* of that same July 17th gives a line on how dazed they are. One story told of Senator Vandenberg's speech to the Senate July 16th on the so-called Big-4 Parley in Paris from which he had just returned. He termed the calling of the Peace Conference of 21 allied nations for July 29 "a paramount achievement."

Privately the Senator might have stated it differently. But, when he put on an equal plane "the suspicion on the one hand that the United States is attempting to organize the world against the Soviets," and on the other hand "the suspicion that the Russians are trying to organize the world against Western civilization," he was lacking in candor. He seemed punch-drunk himself.

When he told the Senate that Russia understands "that we will not bargain in human rights and fundamental liberties anywhere on earth," he either sought to make us laugh, or else he was announcing a policy at absolute variance with

the long followed policy of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. For if anything is clear from American policy of the past thirteen years, it is that we *will* bargain in human rights and fundamental liberties—"anywhere on earth"—including the U. S. A. For our government has betrayed eleven countries into Soviet hands—and has betrayed the liberties of our people at home.

Perhaps Senator Vandenberg *did* intend his statement to be an announcement of a hoped-for change in our foreign policy, for he said that while there could be compromise "within principles," the United States "could no longer compromise with principles themselves, as was done under pressure or real exigency on too many previous occasions."

The "end product," Senator Vandenberg said, "can never be perfection. What may be desired is limited by what may be attainable. The end result must be common ground or there is no peace. Failure is preferable to a pretense of success at the price of unsound compromise or appeasement." Perhaps Senator Vandenberg is getting somewhere. Failure is certainly preferable to a pretense of success. But just about every move made since we "won" the war has been both failure and (at the time) a pretense of success.

And now, just what did Mr. Byrnes and his associates, of whom Mr. Vandenberg was one, actually do in this Big-4 Conference? Well, they compromised on the Trieste question. And it wasn't much of a compromise except in words. Soviet Russia wanted Trieste given to Yugoslavia—that is, to Tito, who, with Stalin, has just murdered Mikhailovitch. We and Britain wanted Trieste to go to Italy since its population is largely Italian. The "compromise" was to turn Trieste over to administration by the United Nations. And who dominates the United Nations? Soviet Russia, of course.

In spite of the big words of Vandenberg, we gave away again to Soviet Russia.

But, turning back to *The New York Times* for July 17, we read on Page 3 that Earl Browder (do you remember him?) "decries our Soviet policy." He asserts that "getting tough" with Russia is "most mischievous." My, oh my! Probably what Browder complains of is such mighty assertions of intentions to get tough as Senator Vandenberg just used in the Senate.

We turn to another headline, on Page 1 of the *Times* for July 17: "Two Russian Envoys in Canada Leaving After Spy Report." People are more hard-headed in Canada than here. Apparently the do-gooders and other soft-headed people there make less of an impression on public policy than here. For following the turning over last Fall by 27-year-old Igor Gouzenko, a Soviet Russian code clerk, of a mass of documents on the espionage system, a Royal Commission was set up. This Commission has reported that the espionage system "was directed from Moscow by the Director of Military Intelligence," and that "the Communist Party of Canada was used as a 'base' for recruiting and developing" for the espionage work—that the Russians directed these activities through their Embassy. The *Times* said the Royal Commission's report "created a sensation in diplomatic quarters in Ottawa." Why not in the United States? The *Times* adds, "While the main outline of the spy operations had been known through previous Commission reports and other trials of Canadians involved, the detailed documentation published yesterday was of deep interest to every government that has a Russian Embassy or Legation in its own capital."

Deep interest, indeed! What is the *Times* talking about—social gossip in the diplomatic set? No, it's speaking of a plot to take over Canada and the United States. And take over means *take over*. When those upstanding Americans who have the audacity to try to revive a free America are stood up and shot, there will be no country left in the world to protest—as some Americans have feebly protested the shooting of Mikhailovitch.

Mr. Gouzenko was quoted in the report as saying that "The same thing (that is, the spy plot) was true in the United States, according to a telegram I saw."

There can be not the slightest doubt that the "same thing" does exist in the United States. Since the stakes for which the Communists are playing here are vastly greater than in Canada, it will be wise for us to assume, if we have not lost our sense of values, that the most elaborate system of spying exists here. This Russian Gouzenko, about whom we know nothing, thought the thing important enough for him to turn against his own country and tell the Canadians what was really going on. The Royal Commission believed what he said. Victor Kravchenko, educated and steeped in Communism and coming to hate it as the arch-enemy of the human individual, thought

enough of his fellowmen, and so little of his own natural interests, to turn against Soviet Russia and to write his book, *I Chose Freedom*.

Yet Senator Vandenberg mentions in the same breath the "suspicion" in Soviet Russia that the United States and Britain are ganging up on Soviet Russia, and the "suspicion" in the United States that Soviet Russia is ganging up on the rest of the world!

If the Vandenberg and the Byrneses can be so taken in, is it surprising other Americans are misled?

* * * * *

We have often expressed disbelief in the United Nations. We feel that for two reasons there is not the slightest basis to believe it can succeed: First, because human nature is what it is; and, second, because Soviet Russia, by the assertions and admission of her leaders, including the late Lenin and the still living Stalin, places no importance on what we Anglo-Saxons know as *truth*. Soviet Russians will lie and deceive to whatever extent necessary. The boss and the stooges of the Soviet government have openly boasted that truth is of no importance—that an oath does not bind them. And yet our simple-minded, rainbow-chasing, idealistic Americans won't have it that this is so. They join, against sceptics like ourselves, in the epithets of "fascist," "anti-Semite," etc., etc. These are, of course, the epithets prepared for them by those very Soviet Russians.

* * * * *

Recently, American manufacturers objected to sending 17,000 tractors to Soviet Russia on the ground they could not fill domestic orders. Drew Middleton, writing from Moscow to *The New York Times*, (Times of July 31st) said with apparent satisfaction that "Ernest C. Ropes, (educated in Russia) chief of the U.S.S.R. Division of the Commerce Department, and (Russian-born) Lewis E. Lorwin, Staff Economist of the Department, have been much impressed during their three-weeks' stay in the Soviet Union with Soviet Trade officials' eagerness for American goods."

Mr. Ropes said further: "There is almost no limit to what they would purchase in the United States if a credit of \$1,000,000,000, which has been discussed, were advanced by the Export-Import Bank."

Does it surprise Mr. Ropes to find that Soviet Russia, having accepted a gift of \$10,000,000,000 of lendlease, would now be willing to accept another billion for goods? Because, of course, to give them the credit to buy the goods would be to give them the goods.

As a matter of fact, every dollar of goods we send to Soviet Russia will be used to build herself up to the point where she can to all the greater advantage make war on the United States.

We believe a different policy should be adopted toward Soviet Russia. She is the proven enemy of the Western World. She plans the subjugation of all of it, including the United States. There is every evidence this is so. There is no evidence it is not so.

A persistent caller, kicked down the stairs three times, finally rubbed his bruised head and said: "Those fellows can't fool me. They don't want me!"

The United States, by pursuing its policy of appeasement, isn't even as bright as that caller. We have taken just about every insult from Soviet Russia, and still our government pretends that Russia likes us. It tells us, "We must understand Russia."

We do not believe the United States should fool around any longer with Soviet Russia. We hold trump cards today. We may not hold them two years from today. If a man were to clothe and feed and lend money to another man he knew was planning to rape his wife, he would be a damned fool. We will be just as big damned fools here in the United States if we tolerate this Soviet nonsense any longer.

We believe we should forthwith adopt the following policy with respect to Soviet Russia:

First, we should outlaw the Communist Party in the United States; deport every Party member who is not a citizen; and revoke the citizenship of every alien-born citizen who is a Communist and ship him back to his own country. And we should ship to some remote island every citizen of the United States who is a card-holding member of or a contributor to the Communist Party.

Second, we should provide the death penalty for every card-holding Communist Party member who holds public office and does not resign from that office within ten days after the signing by the President of the act that makes these provisions; and we should provide life imprisonment for every office-holder proven to have been a cooperator with Communists, and who likewise does not resign.

Third, we should root out and deport every secret spy of Soviet Russia, and if he has violated any of our laws, he should be punished to the limit. The Communist Redin, arrested as a spy in the State of Washington, was freed by a jury that unquestionably had been brought under Communist pressure of every kind. Incidentally, the freeing of this man will tend to discourage the FBI from arresting any more Soviet Russian spies.

Fourth, no Russian citizen should be admitted to the United States except under regulations as strict as those now enforced by Russia against Americans.

Fifth, we should forbid the export, directly or indirectly, of any more goods or services of any nature to Soviet Russia. We should issue no passports to American citizens to visit Russia.

You say this would lead to war with Russia? But, Russia has been at war against the United States since 1919; for all this time she has planned to overthrow the American government by force. And she is at war against us today—on a far vaster scale than ever before. She now feels certain we will fall. She believes the prey is almost within her grasp. And unless Americans rise up and compel their government to have a policy, her estimate will prove correct.

This proposed policy is not directed against the Russian people. *It would work for their benefit.* For 95% of them have been enslaved by the gang in control, just as that gang—aided by its American collaborators will enslave us if we don't prevent it. The greater the promise of loot, the more daring risks will the bandit take. The single fact that from 350,000 to a million Russians turned against the Soviet government and fought on the German side, and the fact that many of the 400 stowaways reaching America from Russian-occupied lands have committed suicide rather than be sent back, show the fear of those people toward this Soviet gang.

The Roosevelt-Truman administration is the main prop of the Soviet government in the world today. If we withhold all help, with goods, money or services, from the Soviet government, that government will probably fall, for the hatred of that government by its own people is implacable.

If the Soviet government falls, the future of the whole world will change. Without the Soviet Comintern to galvanize them, the Communist parties of other countries will wither and die. The Gospel of Christ will have triumphed over Marxian hatred. The sky will clear again for Western civilization.

For the pending threat of Soviet Communism is the curse of the world today.

* * * * *

We believed and urged that OPA should not be revived. But OPA *was* revived. Its revival is the PAC's greatest legislative triumph. Tireless, determined men and women, having "a world to win," as Karl Marx put it, triumphed over a weary Congress, insufficiently supported by people back home.

After rough sledding in both Houses, the OPA measure was thrown into a conference committee, which rewrote the bill. It produced a measure far worse for private enterprise than that vetoed by the President in June. For this measure places well-nigh complete control over our economy in a three-man de-control board. This board is given power to control both production

and profits. For language "including reasonable adjustments for conditions resulting from abnormal value of production" can and probably will be interpreted as a grant of power to adjust prices downward—while wages will be forced upward. Under such an interpretation, there can be no way for a producer to ascertain costs, and there will be no incentive to increase production.

Once a father told his small boy about a horse that was chased by a tiger. The horse ran this way and that but the tiger got ever closer. Finally, said the father, the horse ran up a tree. The boy said, "Why dad, I didn't know a horse could climb a tree." His father, stumped for a moment, replied, "Why son, he *had* to!"

Those scheming to control American economy literally *had* to get OPA reinstated. It was a key-stone in their archway. And, almost unaccountably to relate—they succeeded.

We believe that free private enterprise and what for 150 years has been the American system can be saved—but only if we care enough about it. We must raise our zeal and willingness to work—and contribute—to the level of those who seek to take these things away from us.

Nothing but daring and hard work will do this job. It's the biggest job before us. Yet all too few of our business and moneyed men and women seem to care enough to do much about it.

Just at present many of them are saying with annoyance, "There are *so many* of these organizations that are trying to save America!" There are quite a few. *But there are not nearly enough.* Some of them may not accomplish much. But a few accomplish a great deal. These could multiply their effectiveness many times if given more money. Yet it is often like pulling teeth to get money from great beneficiaries of private enterprise.

We have personally seen, even in the heyday of Roosevelt, an administration measure killed by a Congressional committee because two individuals who knew what they were talking about

stood up and told the Committee the low-down about the bill. To some on that Committee, what these men said was not new—but the public telling of it strengthened the Committee's hands. To other members it was new—they had not had time to get all the facts. So they learned—and acted accordingly. The bill was killed.

Yet while many of our business friends sit in their offices and carp about "so many organizations," it may interest them to know that one of the business leaders of the country, wiser than most of his brethren and familiar with what is going on, recently said that not half the whole anti-American front that battles before Congress for communistic measures has any opposition whatever.

Probably more organizations on the Left side are collecting money from business people—than those on the conservative American side.

It was really by default that OPA was reinstated and the shackless reformed on American industry.

The support of organizations like the National Economic Council by a very few more, zealous Americans could turn the tide for America.

Merwin K. Hart

President

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC.

* * * * *

Effective August 13, Station WOR, New York City, was added to the chain over which Upton Close broadcasts, sponsored by the National Economic Council, Inc. Tuesdays, 10:15 P.M. E.D.S.T.